



---

# PLANNING COMMISSION

Department of Urban Planning & Design P.O. Box 27210 Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

---

Approved by Planning Commission  
on November 5, 2008

Date of Meeting: September 17, 2008

The meeting of the City of Tucson Planning Commission was called to order by Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair, on Wednesday, September 17, 2008, at 7:03 p.m., in the Mayor and Council Chambers, City Hall, 255 W. Alameda Street, Tucson, Arizona. Those present and absent were:

## 1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair  
Brad Holland, Vice Chair  
Rick Lavaty  
Joseph Maher, Jr.  
Shannon McBride-Olson  
Daniel R. Patterson  
William Podolsky  
Fred Ronstadt (departed at 9:37 p.m.)  
Sean Sullivan  
James E. Watson (departed at 8:28 p.m.)  
Daniel J. Williams  
Craig Wissler

Member at Large, Ward 5  
Member, Ward 6  
Member at Large, Ward 1  
Member at Large, Ward 6  
Member, Ward 2  
Member, Ward 5  
Member at Large, Ward 4  
Member, Mayor's Office  
Member at Large, Ward 3  
Member, Ward 4  
Member, Ward 1  
Member, Ward 3

Absent:

Eric R. Cheney

Member at Large, Ward 2

Staff Members Present:

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director  
Ernie Duarte, Development Services, Director  
Jessie Sanders, Development Services, Deputy Director  
Jim Mazzocco, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator  
Chris Kaselemis, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator  
Glenn Moyer, Development Services, Administrator  
Viola Romero-Wright, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
Linus Kafka, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
Adam Smith, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner  
Rebecca Ruopp, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner  
Norma Stevens, Urban Planning and Design, Secretary  
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office, Recording Secretary

## 2. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL: August 20, 2008

It was moved by Commissioner Watson, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 12 to 0 (Commissioner Cheney absent), to approve the minutes of August 20, 2008, with corrections: Pg. 5, 4th paragraph, where the first LUC is mentioned it should read **land use policies and strategies section**, for the 2nd and 3rd mention of LUC in that paragraph, as well as in the 6th paragraph, it should read **land use**.

## 3. JEFFERSON PARK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN (PUBLIC HEARING)

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director, announced that Rebecca Ruopp would make a PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Ronstadt stated, since he was in the audience at the previous meeting, he wanted clarification of an issue or comment made during that presentation about the difference between the Area Plan and Jefferson Park's Plan. He wanted to know how it would get resolved if somebody were to come in and wanted to do something and they were going by the Area Plan versus the Neighborhood Plan.

Chair Rex stated that she had the same question and asked if that was going to be part of the presentation.

Mr. Elias stated staff was going to touch on that topic because it was an issue raised by Commissioner Maher at the last meeting.

Rebecca Ruopp, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the *Jefferson Park Neighborhood Plan*. She said it was the same presentation that was given at the last meeting but because this was a public hearing, the presentation was for the public and the Commissioners who were not present at the previous meeting. She said the boundaries for the *Plan* were bounded on the north by Grant Road, on the south by Lester Street, on the east by Campbell Avenue and on the west by Euclid Avenue. She said the *Plan* was a prototype Neighborhood Plan process, and that there had not been many plans done since the eighties, or early nineties. She said the Department of Urban Planning and Design (UPD) started up a planning process, which they called a prototype process. She said two neighborhoods were selected, Jefferson Park and Miramonte. She said the plan process was a little different than the former neighborhood plans, in that it addressed land use from a rezoning angle, but also addressed some strategic plans or action plans that the neighborhood could actually use as a framework for proceeding to work on various aspects of the quality of life in the neighborhood. The *Plan* was done by UPD with the Drachman Institute as the consultant.

Ms. Ruopp stated, for the kick-off, there was a mailing of over a thousand pieces sent to neighborhood property owners, residents and tenants, outside and inside the Jefferson Park neighborhood. The first mailing included a list of all the public meetings that were scheduled, background meetings and meetings to develop the plan, an application for the Steering Committee, a survey and a description of what it meant to serve on the Steering Committee.

### Citizen Steering Committee

- Application Distribution: Mailing, Ward 3, Drachman Institute and City Website
- Applications Received: 20
- Selection Criteria: Membership in at least one stakeholder category; ability to fulfill role; reasons for wanting to serve
- Selection Committee: Ward 3, UPD, Drachman Institute, and Neighborhood Association President or delegate
- Original Committee Members: 13 (10 residential property, owner-occupied/ resident; 3 residential property, absentee-owner/landlord)
- Members Serving Throughout: 9 (7 residential property, owner-occupied/ resident; 2 residential property, absentee-owners/landlord)
- Number of Meetings: 13

### Public Education, Input, and Review Meetings

- Number of Meetings: 11
- Number of Participants: 150 total sign-ins; largest meeting – 68; smallest meeting – 6
- Notification: Four mailings of 1,000 plus pieces, two 850 plus door knocker hangers; emails to former attendees; handouts at Ward III; website notification; and posters
- Two landscape design charrettes (workshops)

### Plan Implementation

- Neighborhood included in 1989 *University Area Plan*
- Rezoning
- Residential Cluster Projects
- Vacation of City Property
- Capital Improvement Projects
- Variance request
- Strategic plan to guide Neighborhood physical and organizational improvements

### Key Elements

- Vision Statement
- Land Use Goals, Policies and Strategies
  - Goal #1 – Neighborhood Preservation
  - Goal #2 – Neighborhood Landscape & Streetscape
- Community Goals, Policies, and Strategies
  - Goal #3 – Development of Community

## Definitions

- Vision Statement – a consensus work picture of desired future
- Goals – general definition of the desirable future state of the Neighborhood
- Policies – commitments to the course of action that will lead the Neighborhood toward its goals
- Strategies – available or recommended means for implementation of the policies

## Goals

- Goal #1 – Neighborhood Preservation

Policy 1.1 – Protect historic architectural styles

Strategies

- Encourage maintenance & preservation of historic to traditional structures
- Pursue Federal Historic District designation
- Develop mechanism to restrict demolition for historic properties

Policy 1.2 – Preserve the traditional low-density single story character of the Neighborhood's traditional density, fabric and form without discouraging its healthy diversity of architectural styles

Strategies

- Utilize proposed NPZ and Design Manual program to implement strategies related to:
  - a. Density in R-1 zones
  - b. Height
  - c. Setbacks
  - d. Additional Structures
  - e. Lot Coverage
  - f. Parking
- Notify Neighborhood Association of variance applications and Design Development Option (DDO) applications. In the spirit of cooperation, the applicant is strongly encouraged to meet with the Jefferson Park Neighborhood Association Board for review and comments. It is also recommended that the applicant review the Association bylaws to determine if any provisions apply to Association Board actions related to variances or DDO applications.
- Preserve pattern and function of mid-block alleys; retain garbage pick-up in alleys; relocate recycling containers to mid-block alleys; solid waste and utility equipment should have alley service.

Policy 1.3 – Preserve the traditional character by insuring that future land use is consistent with existing land use

#### Strategies

- In contradiction to the *University Area Plan* recommend against conversion of:
  - a. Residential uses to commercial uses (O to C) along Grant, Campbell, and Euclid
  - b. Low-density residential uses (R-1) to medium density residential uses (R-2) in any part of Neighborhood
  - c. Any remaining low density residential uses (R-1) to medium density residential uses (R-2) or commercial uses (O or C) along the east side of Euclid
  - d. Remaining low density residential uses (R-1) along the east side of Park between Waverly and Lester, to medium density residential (R-2) or commercial (O or C)

- Goal #2 - Neighborhood Landscape & Streetscape

Policy 2.1 – Jefferson Park Neighborhood will implement a master plan of public landscape and streetscape improvements, including neighborhood edges, nodes, and traffic calming. In particular, the Jefferson Park Neighborhood shall work cooperatively with adjacent neighborhoods on a plan for redevelopment of Park Avenue

#### Strategies

- Utilize preliminary concepts in master plan as a starting point for public right-of-way improvements implemented by public agencies through public funding. Concepts include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Grant Road
  - b. Euclid Avenue
  - c. Campbell Avenue
  - d. Fremont Avenue
  - e. Park Avenue
  - f. Other Traffic Calming
  - g. Neighborhood Parks
  - h. Jefferson Park School
  - i. Sidewalks
  - k. “Green Southern Edge”
- Work with Ward 3, City Transportation, Pima Community Development and Neighborhood Conservation, the University of Arizona, or other appropriate entities on implementing master plan concepts. Pursue creative approach for planning, designing, and constructing landscape and streetscape improvements through such public funding sources as:
  - City Back to Basics
  - Pima County Neighborhood Reinvestment
  - Regional Transportation Authority
  - State Highway Use Revenue
  - Federal Transportation Enhancement

- Goal #3 - Development of Community

Policies

- Promote the development and enhancement of amenities to attract families
- Integrate students and youth
- Encourage renters to be actively involved
- Establish a comprehensive plan for neighborhood crime prevention
- Promote health and beauty through consistent maintenance of public and private property, including alleys
- Promote involvement of residents in governance and activities

Ms. Ruopp explained that the first goal had the most conversation. The other two had great enthusiasm and involvement, but not the same kinds of concerns. She said, in regards to the Planning Commission's comments and/or questions from the last meeting, the following were her responses:

1. Greenways/Alleys potential – Ms. Ruopp discussed whether or not having vehicles in the alleys would conflict with the ideas of having greenways. She stated that staff concurred with the comments regarding alleyways and were focused on using them for recycling and garbage pick up and to eliminate the unsightly containers from streets. She said the improvements would further encourage pedestrian activity along the more highly visible streetscape. She said this did not mean that the idea of greenways could not be looked at, but they wanted to be clear about what people were concerned about when they wrote the Neighborhood Plan.

2. No rezoning along arterials – Ms. Ruopp said the issue that was brought up was whether or not there might be appropriate density, more dense uses going back to the *University Area Plan*. She said it was discussed that when the neighborhood started their plan, the Grant Road Project was underway. She said the feeling was to not second-guess the Grant Road Project and that this issue would come back. She stated until there was a proposal that could be reviewed and carefully considered in terms of the potential impact of neighborhood goals, the feeling was to leave it at the existing land use and have conversation from there. She said participants discussed the potential increase of development options along Euclid, which was zoned within the neighborhood boundaries, and was the place where there was more variation in the zoning from the R-1's, so there were some R-2's, C-1's and a C-1 at the corner. She stated that many of the participants expressed a reluctance to deviate from the existing R-1 given their feeling that the historic single family residential integrity and scale of the neighborhood had been increasingly threatened.

Ms. Ruopp stated that since the onset of the neighborhood plan, the Neighborhood Preservation Zone (NPZ) had entered the picture. She said part of that discussion included consideration of where more intense non-single family residential uses might go if they wanted to be located within the core of the historic neighborhoods. She said the conclusion was to begin thinking about locating such uses along arterials, which was the NPZ discussion. The conclusion was consistent with the general planning goals for the City. She stated that the placement of more intense uses needed to be done strategically

with careful consideration of the specific location and surrounding uses. She said, in the case of the Jefferson Park Neighborhood, single family residences were located along the portion of Grant Road within the neighborhood and along a much smaller portion of Euclid. She said the Campbell Avenue frontage within the neighborhood was addressed with the widening of Campbell Avenue in the area, and the location of the screening wall was addressed along with the neighborhood boundary.

Ms. Ruopp said, for Grant Road, staff agreed that a case could be made to use a suggestion in the *University Area Plan* for non-single family residential uses to be developed with sensitivity to the scale design and historic integrity of the surrounding neighborhood. She said regarding Euclid Avenue, additional analysis was needed to determine the extent to which commercial and non-residential uses could be accommodated, while still respecting the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Ruopp stated that those were the responses to the Commission's questions. There was also a question asked about whether the Steering Committee, and others that reviewed the plan, understood that this was an advisory plan. She said the Neighborhood Plan was an advisory plan and that the committee understood.

Chair Rex asked if there were any comments by the Commissioners before she opened the Public Hearing. Hearing none, she stated that there were six cards and if anyone else wanted to speak they needed to fill out a card. She announced that speakers had three minutes to speak and to state their name and address for the record.

Dyer Lytle stated he was President of the Jefferson Park Neighborhood for the past six years, which covered the time they have been working on the neighborhood plan and he was head of the Steering Committee working on the neighborhood plan. He said the neighborhood plan carefully followed the process outlined by the City, and felt they had done a good job. He stated that they had done their best to get input from all the stakeholders involved. He said the Plan represented the will of the neighbors based on that process, not of the Steering Committee members. He said the recommendations received would be used in the Neighborhood Preservation Overlay Zone Design Manual. He said they also understood the document was not regulatory, but advisory. He encouraged the Planning Commission to support the Plan and recommend it to Mayor and Council.

Bob Schlanger stated he was the Vice President of the Jefferson Park Neighborhood Association and Co-Chair of the Steering Committee. He said the association and committee understood fully that the plan was not regulatory. He said the items in the plan, he felt, supported the goal of keeping Jefferson Park an R-1 single family neighborhood. He said they hoped that anyone wishing to purchase and develop property in the neighborhood would refer to the plan and confer with the neighborhood prior to moving forward. He said they would also like to advise the City of Tucson as to what was important to the neighborhood and what they would like to see changed in the Land Use Code (LUC).

Mr. Schlanger said they had a discussion at their last meeting regarding the O-1 zoning along Grant. He said, until they had a situation where they could trust the City,

they would have to be opposed to any O-1. He said if you looked at the building at Campbell and Grant, the Goldberg and Osborne Building, that was O-1 and it was as contrary to the intent of O-1 as mini dorms are contrary to the intent of R-1. He said until something was worked out he would not mind, conceptually, O-1 along Grant, but said they needed to have some system they could trust so they did not have office buildings lining the entirety of Grant Road backing up to R-1 property. He said they had very little R-1, this was a historic neighborhood, and they had to protect every bit of it. He said they have worked very hard over the years on many projects. They had brought over a million dollars worth of grant monies into the neighborhood for improvements, and had done all sorts of things with sidewalks, pocket parks, landscaping, and the new Park Avenue project coming up. He said the neighborhood plan would enable them to get more grants and that it was a great tool to use to move forward in enhancing the neighborhood. He encouraged the Commission to pass the Plan and forward it to the Mayor and Council.

Rebecca Mason stated she had lived in her house for thirty-six years and that Jefferson Park was an all time neighborhood. She said most people worked and that was why there were not many people in attendance at the meeting. She said there were not any notifications of meetings the way there should have been, or cards on doors. She said the language of the Plan was so nebulous and felt no one did anything to help and were mostly “big bodies” with City Planners that did a bad job. She said there were City Planners involved in the Drachman Institute that she felt was a conflict of interest. She said what was going on was that the University of Arizona (U of A) wanted her neighborhood and wanted them out. She said that was why they had a parking plan so that if you did not put a sign on the cars of visitors they would get ticketed. She said they have made it so difficult to live in her neighborhood and that the character of the neighborhood has been destroyed by about fifty percent. She said that the U of A took a big chunk of the neighborhood in the early seventies and people had committed suicide over it. She said the elderly were driven out of their homes and now the U of A wanted the rest of the neighborhood.

Ms. Mason said after the seventies, the “big” Campbell project took place for five years, day and night, where you could not read or do homework with your child because of the noise level. She said many of the neighbors were driven out. She said original owners were driven from their homes, because they could not stand to live in the neighborhood. She said they have crack houses, speed houses and party houses, and all people could talk about was plans and neighborhood improvement. She said the neighborhood was in crisis and she begged and ordered the developers out of her neighborhood. She said the only way the neighborhood could recover was if the planners got out and life went back for normal. She said kids could not play in the neighborhood anymore because of the traffic since the Campbell Avenue project. The neighborhood was not getting protection of any sort and apartment complexes were being built constantly for more parties, more students, and more people being driven out of the neighborhood. She said the school down the street always had kids playing there and had a whole variety of kids. She said that now you would have a hard time finding every type of child in the school. She said there are almost no blonds or red heads in the school. They were driven out of the school and it was a mess. She said what was happening was that the U of A wanted the neighborhood and that the Campbell Avenue



project was put in to join up with the freeway that was coming up Grant Road. She said that was what was going on, the U of A, the Grant Road freeway, and more Campbell Avenue freeway. She said all the streetscape and other “stuff” was just silly nonsense.

Richard Studwell stated he had objections with a few portions of the Plan. He was in agreement with a good portion of the Plan, but did not agree with the contradiction to the Area Plan, the City’s Transportation Plan, or the Council’s direction on density along major corridors. He said he thought it created some 207 issues and we had a situation where there was not enough neighborhood input. He said there was no vote of the neighbors. The Committee was thirteen people, ten owner occupants and three non-owner rental occupants, one of which quit right away because of a timing conflict. He said for the City Planning Department, this was a sixty percent rental neighborhood. He said adjacent to the area, there were a number of U of A students, and that there were no students on the Committee. There was no input sought from the university and no vote to adopt the Plan. He said some of the provisions in the Plan would make many of the houses non-conforming. He said things like the height limit of sixteen feet for two story buildings could not be done. He asked the Commission to refer the portion of the Plan that was not agreeable to everybody back to a committee. He said a great deal of the Plan was agreeable, it was generic, and something that would encourage re-development of any neighborhood, but some of it was the desires of very few people.

Curt Ench stated he was a resident, member of the Steering Committee and an architect. He said he and his wife liked living in the neighborhood and bought a small house, eleven hundred square feet and have added about fifteen hundred square feet. He said they have a seventy-five hundred square foot lot, the small version, because there were some lots ten thousand square feet or larger. In essence, he had a twenty-six hundred square foot home, three bedrooms, two baths, a home workshop, swimming pool, and a big front yard. He said it was quite wonderful and they planned on staying and retiring there. He said he felt that a professional couple or a young family could easily put a home in within the guidelines established. He said the provisions also allowed for a second story portion that is modest and small enough.

Mr. Ench said his feelings about Grant Road were that he understood it had been a long term policy toward having more density on arterials, but that really was a general statement and did not think anyone intended it to be a uniform “one size fits all” throughout the community. He said he thought that some of the streets, such as Campbell and Catalina Heights, throughout some of the older neighborhoods that have been residential for decades, were good reasons to keep that type of breath of fresh air in Tucson. He said until everyone knew what was going to happen to Grant Road, he felt it would be good for the Grant Road planners to treat it with sensitivity, that it was residential, R-1 type property. He said if there was some variation from that in the future, maybe near corners, obviously that would be something that everybody would want to consider fairly. He said in the meantime, he felt all the planners should be very sensitive to treating those edges both toward his neighborhood and others that have been residential since the beginning of Tucson, with acoustical treatment, landscape treatment, and other buffer treatments. He said there were plenty of wonderful cities in the country that were not one hundred percent commercial along arterials.

Dana Weant stated he was a member of the Steering Committee. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to make brief comments regarding the Jefferson Park Neighborhood Plan. He said he returned to the United States about three years ago after twenty years in the Foreign Service. He said a few months upon returning, he received a post card in the mail notifying him about the desire to establish the Steering Committee for the purpose of understanding what people in the neighborhood wanted to do and what they imagined the future of the neighborhood to be. He said they rented their home while overseas, but did visit the neighborhood from time to time. He said he was new to Arizona and was struck by the diversity of architecture and residents by age, background and occupation. He stated, in his view, it was a pleasant place to live. He said his personal desire was to maintain the character of the neighborhood, so he asked to join the committee. He said he was struck, during the entire time, by the professionalism and objectivity of the committee. He said he participated on a number of occasions, and in addition to the mail notices, hanging the door flyers in the neighborhood, along with a number of college students. He said he felt adequate notice was given to people and had enthusiastic turnout to the meetings. He stated the landscaping workshops, in particular, were well attended and participants were energetic about what they could do to spruce up the neighborhood. He thanked Rebecca Ruopp and the Drachman Institute for going out of their way to maintain objectivity during the process. He said they lent very useful expertise, but never tried to push the Committee in any particular direction. He stated they incorporated comments in the larger meetings, to the extent possible, where he felt the Plan represents the views of the neighbors and the people living in Jefferson Park.

Linda Small stated she has lived in her home for about eleven years and that the character of the neighborhood had changed. She said she thought it was still zoned residential on her block, but believed she was the only owner occupied home. She said there was a church and two houses that were somehow linked together and people parked in the rear. She said down the block from her, there was a home in which there was a recreational vehicle and people lived in the backyard. She said there were times she came home and could not park at her own house because of others parking there. She said she felt the Plan was in conflict with the Grant Road widening. She said the Grant Road Committee had gone through an extraordinary amount of trouble to collect public comment and to offer alternatives and choices to people. She said many of the options given to them were preferable than the residential one because it allowed developers to create something that would be safe. She said there was a bus stop in front of her house and talked about pullouts. She said the Grant Road widening project would have to include things dealing with safety. She spoke about the incident where a teenager was killed because a bus made a right hand turn. She said every block had an entryway on to Grant Road and that some of those streets needed to be closed off. She also said there were driveways pulling onto three lanes of traffic in each direction on Grant Road. She said there were some real safety issues and proposals for delayed left turns. She encouraged the Commission to have the major arterials, Euclid, Grant Road and possibly Park, not be zoned residential so the other proposals could be considered and people would not be held captive by one neighborhood plan sitting in the midst of the project going forward and on each side. She stated she was opposed to the project and opposed to the way it was presented. She said requested daytime meetings for elderly to attend were not held and no vote was taken. She too asked for the Plan to be returned to the

Committee and was more in favor of the plan that was set out by the University of Arizona.

Chair Rex asked if there was any one else wishing to speak. Hearing none, she asked the Commissioners if they had any questions or comments.

Commissioner Maher stated he was elated that the City was on the path to re-doing neighborhood plans. He felt the prototype was a great start and thought a lot of great work had gone into it. He said the preservation aspects, in his mind, were key. He said, as an architect, he was confused with some of the aspects. He said traditionally, the same way you have a sequence of spaces or areas, was the same way in a neighborhood in terms of the perimeter. He said the perimeter was usually more intense outside and would lessen as you progress inside to the neighborhood. He said the perimeter ends up being a buffer to all of the area inside.

Commissioner Maher said Mountain Avenue had a lot of improvements, but the majority of the street was walled in, with a little landscaping, but no houses, just a walled corridor. He said along Euclid, in his opinion, was a dead man's curve. That was a terrible curve where people were backing out of their driveways on to the street. He said he did not see why this area could not be zoned R-2 or R-4 apartments because the houses were too close to the street edge. He said he was confused that the law office did not follow the parameters of O-1 zoning which suggested that they match the character and architecture of the surroundings. He also said he was curious about comments on the Grant Road proposal. He said he wondered where the snake roadway would go. He said the changes done on Campbell were not that desirable, but seemed to be the most appropriate way if trying to retain the houses with the set back and what was done along Campbell. He said, unless there was some commercial or some sort of buffer allowed by the new street improvements along Grant, there will continue to be a string of "slummy" houses or rentals that are undesirable. He asked staff if there was a study that would tell if a neighborhood was stabilized with more ownership and stabilize the perimeter so that it was at least good looking, had improvements, and that maybe more ownership could be encouraged.

Mr. Elias stated he could not remember a particular study in question, but thought that the character of a neighborhood was defined in part by the edge. He said what he heard from the neighborhood folks on the widening of Grant Road was, until some certainty was developed, they felt inclined to keep it residential. He also shared that the University Area Plan policies allowed conversion of residential uses on arterial streets to residentially scaled offices had been done in several instances along Grant Road. He said with respect to the streetscape, they pretty much fit in, and maybe the exception was the one on the corner. He said if you looked at the O-1 on that stretch of Grant Road they seemed to fit in, in terms of scale and architectural style. He suggested this was a key policy change and that the neighborhood was proposing to keep it residential and move away from the existing land use policy which was to allow the conversion of these uses to residentially scaled offices.

Mr. Elias added that was on Euclid; it was never studied what could be possible along Grant Road. He said the situation was different where some of the houses front

Euclid and some of them did not. He said because the neighborhood expressed the desire to keep the existing zoning as is, staff did not look carefully at how non-residential use could be integrated.

It was moved by Commissioner Lavaty, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 12 to 0 (Commissioner Cheney absent) to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Sullivan stated he felt the Plan was a good, solid plan and suggested moving it on to the Mayor and Council. He did have one issue. He said three of the things the Plan attempted to do were to prevent extensive traffic, revitalize pedestrian community and redevelopment of Park Avenue. He said policy 1.3 had some conflict with it which stated future land use must stay consistent with existing land use. He said he felt an opportunity would be missed to look at arterials and possibly Park Avenue and Mountain Avenue. He said they should be developed in way to make them a village type of development so, they needed to be pedestrian friendly neighborhoods where there were services and businesses people could walk to get those services within their neighborhood. He felt that could be addressed in the plan and again suggested that a recommendation be sent to the Mayor and Council for approval with a caveat that future comprehensive studies be made that would include people in the neighborhood to look at development and redevelopment of the arterials including commercial and mixed use to achieve some of the goals outlined. He said it remained consistent with what has been established in the NPZ and felt it important to protect the character within the core of the area but also look at opportunities to develop in ways that were different that had not been done in Tucson historically. This would create a different and better development that could be an asset to a neighborhood. He said the neighborhood should be included in the studies. He did not support a policy that gave carte blanche to O-1 commercial mixed uses along arterials.

Chair Rex asked if his comments were a motion.

Commissioner Sullivan stated that he would make it a motion.

It was moved by Commissioner Sullivan, duly seconded to adopt the Jefferson Neighborhood Plan with the request that future studies on arterials are included for developments on Euclid, Mountain, Grant and Park.

Chair Rex asked if there were any further discussions.

Commissioner Williams asked, during the development of the Plan, how much contention was there between the different neighbors and the people that lived there in developing the plan on the consensus or feeling towards the Plan.

Ms. Ruopp stated there were two meetings to review the plan. The first one was about sixty people, which were quite supportive. The second meeting had more contention on the strategies from a number of people. She said one issue was on the density of arterials. Since then, she said she had received phone calls for copies of the Plan or asking questions about the Plan. From the people calling, she said there was some confusion about the Plan versus the NPZ program. One caller had issues with the

overlay programs. She said she explained and clarified the confusion with the caller. She said the whole idea was to be informative.

Commissioner Williams stated he had concerns with Grant Road remaining residential once it was widened to six lanes. He said he felt that it would not be a good or safe place to live and it definitely would be noisy, unless you had a big noise wall in front of your property. He said it was not realistic to have that as a livable condition. He said he thought, when Grant Road was widened, that residential along Grant Road would not be the appropriate zoning. He said opportunities needed to be looked at to make it something the neighborhood could be proud of and something that fit in without it being residential.

Mr. Elias stated, one point of information relating to the motion, was that he believed Grant, Euclid and Campbell were all arterial streets in the Major Streets and Routes Plan. He said Mountain Avenue and Park Avenue were collector streets in the Plan. He said the motion referenced that redevelopment of the arterials be studied, but he wanted to make it clear which streets were involved.

Chair Rex stated she was of the understanding that the motion included the collectors in the Major Streets and Routes Plan.

Commissioner Sullivan answered affirmatively and stated he could amend the motion to take out the word arterials and just say Major Streets and Routes Plan.

Chair Rex asked a question on the mechanics. She said if the Plan went forward and the studies were undertaken and modifications were suggested for the roadway improvements or redevelopment, how would the neighborhood plan be modified to incorporate the changes.

Mr. Elias said if the study was done, and recommendations were made in the study that involve changing the land use policies in the Plan, it would require amending the Plan. The Commission would have another public hearing to discuss how to amend the Plan.

Commissioner Lavaty asked if it made sense to add an additional strategy to Policy 1.3 rather than coming back and trying to do a Plan Amendment with all the costs incurred, it would be unlikely for it to advance, since it was a one sentence policy. He said perhaps a modification or insertion of an additional strategy would allow for the interpretation of the one sentence policy to include incorporation of future study.

Mr. Elias stated that was an option if it was the pleasure of the Commission to have it inserted as a strategy now rather than later. As pointed out, the strategies inform how the policies get executed so including it as a strategy or as a Plan Amendment could be handled either way.

Commissioner Maher stated he would support the language now rather than later to make it more complete, unless the Commission wanted to wait until the study for Grant Road was decided and where the right-of-way would go, how the snake road would

go, how much room there was, or which side of the street would get the brunt of it. He felt it needed to be addressed at this point and not try to guess work and hopefully have a guideline now instead of vague language. He commented on some of the specifics about the architectural items, the logistics, even though the Plan was meant to be a reference document and not the NPZ. He said sixteen or twenty feet were not enough for a two-story building and created somewhat of an instant slum in his mind in terms of creating that type of construction. He said there were other ways of handling the proportions scale and in being specific as well as just saying sixteen or twenty feet and not designate where it goes to. That was already a problem in the LUC and he hated to see this as a confusing point in a document he felt was excellent and on the path for helping Tucson be a better place.

Commissioner Sullivan stated he was in agreement with including the actual language of the motion within the document as a strategy. This was also agreed upon by the seconder.

Commissioner Ronstadt asked for clarification of the motion and if discussion was to hold a study for commercial activity along the collectors, Mountain and Park Avenues specifically.

Chair Rex stated her understanding was that they were talking about Grant and Euclid, which were both arterials, and Mountain and Park which were collectors and the redevelopment, not necessarily commercial, but a study of what was the most appropriate development along those streets, whether it is residential, commercial, multi-family mixed use. She said that was what would come out in the studies.

Commissioner Ronstadt stated, given his knowledge of the neighborhood, he did not want to expose the collectors to anything beyond residential. He said he was fine with the arterials, but that collectors made him nervous.

Commissioner Holland commended the Committee for the work they did. He said it was amazing to bring this many people, with so many agendas, together and come up with something that essentially everyone, with minor deviations, had agreed on. He agreed with Mr. Ronstadt in protecting, or at least not opening Pandora's Box on the collector streets. He said once we say we have permission to tinker with collector streets, looking at what Mountain and Park look like, all bets were off. He said it was very difficult to put the horse back in the barn. He said he had no problem revisiting what happened on arterial streets, but saw the tinkering of collector streets go very, very wrong, like, Pima for instance. He said he was hesitant to green light a discussion for, "would it not be neat if," on a sensitive and delicate mix on the collectors.

Chair Rex stated it was her understanding that it was a study of what could go there and in fact in the Plan they were suggesting that Park be taken off as a collector and returning to a local street. She said it might end up being one of the possible outcomes of the study. She said she felt it could go either way if the study was allowed.

Mr. Elias said that he felt staff had the idea of what the Commission wanted in regards to the motion. He suggested an approach to give staff a chance to craft the

language for the additional strategy and bring the Plan back to the Commission at the October meeting. He said he did not want to delay the process any longer because the people who worked on the Plan were eager to move it forward. He said he felt he needed to give the Commission something in writing that could be looked at and reviewed and also confirmed that they have captured exactly what the essence of the strategy was.

Commissioner McBride-Olson stated she agreed with Commissioners Ronstadt and Holland regarding the collector streets. She said the neighborhood should think very seriously, along Euclid and Grant, about protecting themselves with office use. She stated she lived in a neighborhood that was protected on two sides, on the west by office use O-1 and O-2, and on the north by apartments. She said it was a blessing to her neighborhood and very protective. She felt it was appropriate to think about that in conjunction with whatever was going on with Grant Road.

Chair Rex stated that a motion and second was on the floor and discussion to bring the Plan back to the meeting in October with added language. She asked if they needed to cancel the motion and re-open the Public Hearing or continue the item.

Viola Romero-Wright, Principal City Attorney, stated that the Commission had a motion, a second of the motion, and the motion had been stated so it was before the Commission. The motion maker, if he chose to, could ask the Commission members to withdraw his motion. If approved a new motion would need to be made to continue the Public Hearing until the next Planning Commission date. She reminded the Commission Members, if the motion maker did not want to withdraw the motion, there would need to be reasons for the recommendation that were not included in the motion.

Mr. Elias stated staff would want to ideally continue the item to a date and time certain that would take care of the notice issue.

Commissioner Sullivan asked permission from the Commission to withdraw his original motion.

Chair Rex asked for a motion to continue the Public Hearing to the October meeting.

Commissioner Ronstadt stated, since the Public Hearing was closed, he did not think it was the Commissions' desire to hold another Public Hearing. He said he thought it was just to have the language inserted in the document and reviewed by the Commission in order to forward the item to the Mayor and Council for approval.

It was moved by Commissioner Ronstadt, duly seconded, to direct staff to insert the additional language discussed regarding the arterials and bring back the Plan for the Commissioners' review at the next meeting without opening the Public Hearing. Motion passed by a voice vote of 12 to 0 (Commissioner Chaney absent).

(Commissioner Watson departed at 8:28 p.m.)

#### **4. FLEXIBLE LOT DEVELOPMENT (FLD) LUC AMENDMENT (CONTINUED STUDY SESSION)**

Adam Smith, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner, stated at last month's meeting he gave an overview of the "draft" Flexible Lot Development (FLD). He said he would not review the information already presented but would review the revisions made to the "draft" and at a request made at the last meeting, he would review some responses to stakeholder issues, but he would not go over every issue raised. Those were placed at each of the Commissioner's place settings for their review.

Mr. Smith stated, with the exception of revisions made to the privacy mitigation and architectural variation plans, the changes made to the August 12th "draft" for the FLD were largely organizational in nature and in some cases, procedural. He said the language in the "draft" was changed to be more assertive or more regulatory in nature. The language in previous drafts was too passive and did not explicitly require particular submittals and when they were required.

Mr. Smith said on pages five and eight of the September 10th "draft", in the FLD Submittal Review and Approval sections, in the previous "draft" these were actually two separate sections and have now been consolidated into one section to remove redundancy and reworded to clarify that section to detail exactly what the submittals are and when they must be processed. He said the privacy mitigation plan on page thirteen no longer required a separate application and review process. He said this was a change made in response to some concerns from the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA). He said the privacy mitigation plan itself is required but no longer a separate application process. It was folded into other submittal processes. FLD plans five acres or less were reviewed with the preliminary development plan, and FLDs over five acres were reviewed with the subdivision plat or development plan, whichever was applicable.

Mr. Smith said on pages seventeen through nineteen, the architectural variation section had been reorganized to clarify exactly when the garage placement and architectural variation requirements were required. He said, like the privacy mitigation plans, the architectural variation plans were no longer a separate application. However, what was different than in the privacy mitigation plan was a lot more discretion as to when this was submitted. But, if required, it must be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. He said the reason more flexibility was built in was because, typically at the time of a preliminary development plan or even at the time of a subdivision plat, a developer may have no idea what the actual design of the building would look like. They knew the configuration of the lot, knew where the streets would go, where the detention basins would be, but they did not know what the façade of the structures themselves would be. He said that was the reason they allowed maximum flexibility as to when these could be submitted and reviewed.

Mr. Smith said due to the architectural compatibility with the national historic register districts, staff was recommending that this be removed from the "draft" until the Neighborhood Preservation Zone (NPZ) could be completed for the Feldman and Jefferson Park Neighborhoods, and it could be evaluated how the compatibility reviews for those areas were going.



Mr. Smith said that on pages twenty-three to twenty-seven was the Administrative Review section. Similar to the section in the LUC, it had been reorganized to remove redundancy, reduce cross referencing, and to group the submittal requirements for each submittal into one separate section. He said staff also reworded the language to make it stronger and more regulatory in nature.

Mr. Smith said in the Design Examiner section on pages twenty-eight to twenty-nine, the powers and duties section was reorganized to clarify that the architectural variation plan and the privacy mitigation was actually done as part of the FLD review. He said the way it was worded before, it seemed as though those two plans were separate processes and had no attachment to the FLD. He said staff also removed some procedural matters and included them in 23A of the “draft.”

Mr. Smith reviewed with the Commissioners stakeholder issues:

- FLD Flexibility
- Various Requirements
- 4:1 slope requirement
- Privacy Mitigation Plans
- Detention basins
- Housing affordability and commercial viability
- Perimeter yard requirements
- Grandfathering RCPs previously approved
- FLDs five acres or less

Commissioner Williams asked about the Clarion Report and the rewriting of the LUC. He asked how the report would affect the administrative reports once it was written into the LUC.

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director, stated the easiest way to look at it was if the FLD was approved by the Mayor and Council, those regulations, including the administrative processes, would stay as approved and would not change until the point when the Mayor and Council adopted changes to the LUC. He said it could be at least eighteen months into the future.

Commissioner Lavaty asked on one of the responses to stakeholders regarding the 4:1 slope requirement, was it staff’s position to pull it out of the “draft” of the FLD or to leave it open for possible modifications.

Mr. Smith stated staff was open to re-examining this requirement at the Commission’s direction. He said this was a requirement put into the “draft” at the time of the Infill Subcommittee. He said every site was different and has different demands.

Further discussion ensued regarding:

- 4:1 slope
- Retention/Detention basins

- OSHA requirements on slopes
- Proper use of land

Commissioner Patterson said he had a question for staff regarding the September 10th “draft” of the document. He said on page three, Item H, the change of the word from Providing to Encouraging was a significant change and asked why it was made. He asked if it could be changed back.

Mr. Smith stated it had been changed because there was no specific requirement within the FLD requiring sustainability to “green building.” He said it was something that was encouraged in the “draft” by providing an incentive for it. He said the change was made to more accurately reflect the extent to which the ordinance allowed these items.

Further discussion was held regarding the language in Item H and how it affects the purpose of the Plan. It was agreed that direction would be given to staff on the wording for that item.

Commissioner Mayer stated that Mr. Smith had done a great job in consolidating some of the aspects he had concerns about, like the two-story requirement. He said on page seventeen where it listed the architectural aspects, he was assuming that we depend on some input from the developer or architect for the project. He said on page nineteen it was struck out and was curious why.

Mr. Smith stated, if there was an FLD in a NPZ, they were still subject to the regulations of the NPZ. He said staff, upon further reflections, decided to take out that section because they wanted to evaluate how effectively they could review for architectural compatibility once the NPZs were approved and re-evaluated. He said there was a requirement in the current Residential Cluster Project (RCP) which stated, for RCPs four acres or less, development should be architecturally compatible. He said the RCP did not go much beyond that to provide specifics as to what architectural compatibility was.

Mr. Smith said, on page nine, 3.6.1.5, subsection A, there was a provision added, Compliance with the General Plan and other Applicable Plans, so if there were design related recommendations in the neighborhood plan, this was one mechanism by which those could be put into the FLD or that the development within the FLD could comply with the neighborhood plans.

Chair Rex asked, if the way 3.6.1.5 was worded would work with the Jefferson Park Plan. She said the way she understood it was that the neighborhood plan supersedes the area plan.

Mr. Smith stated he thought the section within Jefferson Park referred specifically to the NPZ.

Mr. Elias stated he felt that was correct, and the intention was that those strategies would be used in the NPZ and would become the starting point for the discussion with

the NPZ. He said they were not policies, per se, of the neighborhood plan. He said what staff would be looking for were policies in the neighborhood plan that would be applicable with respect to the design.

Chair Rex stated on page eighteen, item (b) (ii) Architectural Variation, one of the items listed would be color. She said the Infill Subcommittee specifically removed color and suggested putting in ornamentation.

Commissioner Podolsky stated he requested to look at the qualifications of the Design Examiner. He said he still felt rather strong about the architectural aspect, even though it was advisory, that the qualifications should be a registered architect and not a registered landscape architect. He said it was still in the “draft” document as either/or. He wanted to know what the staff’s and commission’s feelings were on the issue.

Mr. Smith stated staff was trying to keep its potential pool of candidates quite open, but was open to reducing it down to a registered architect if that was the Commission’s directive. He said he spoke to a staff member who was a landscape architect and after looking at the ordinance, felt like they could review plans for privacy mitigation and architectural variation. He said, again, staff was open to taking out the registered landscape architect provision.

Commissioner Wissler stated, to understand Commissioner Podolsky’s opinion, he asked if there were any other broader interests in terms of practice laws and anything relevant to the issue.

Commissioner Podolsky said there was nothing from a legal standpoint, but felt the background of a registered architect is somewhat different of a registered landscaper. He said he felt if something is being reviewed for site compliance, a registered architect’s eye would be more sensitive to picking those up than a landscape architect.

Commissioner Williams said at the Infill Subcommittee meetings it was discussed in length. They spoke about who would be qualified and having a minimum of two people reviewing instead of one because it was difficult for one person to capture everything. He said he felt that was more appropriate because more insight and input would be given. He said if a landscape architect has the qualifications, it could be a landscape architect as opposed to an architect.

Vice Chair Holland said the whole process regarding the Design Examiner came down to qualifications versus judgment. For instance, in his experience, there were some requirements which required all judges to be lawyers and some courts did not. He said often times it was a toss up on where justice was best served. He said in the selection process for the Design Examiner, there was an eye for judgment and skills, the issue of budget and pool of talent. He said he felt the Commission’s concerns were valid but thought there were talented individuals out there with very academic qualifications who may have judgment that fits the job description.

Commissioner Williams stated there were a lot of landscape features in the “draft” as well as architectural features. He said maybe it was appropriate to have one of each so they can both give feedback to one another.

Commissioner Maher stated he liked the idea of having two. He said he was under the impression these individuals may be subcontracted services and not necessarily on the payroll, so that staff had a choice of who to select for a particular project.

Mr. Elias stated it made more sense, from a financial budget point of view, to look at perhaps contracting for these services with the possibility of several different individuals on a list for staff to choose from. That would allow staff to get different opinions from different individuals, the flexibility to tap into a certain qualification that one individual might have that the next one would not have, which would be useful for the particular review being done at that time. He said that would be the approach he preferred to take to manage this service when they decided to bring it on. He said he doubted that a full time position would be hired to start. He said, prior to justifying a position, staff would need to gather information for a period of time on how much work is entailed and the number of hours before considering hiring someone full time.

Mr. Elias said, as far as Commissioner Williams’ point, he felt it made sense to have different voices, at least initially, as staff learns how difficult or how challenging it is to look at the issues such as the functionality of the open space, what amenities might be there, the architectural variations, and how difficult or how easy it is to achieve. He said initially, staff would be best served by having a few different options.

Chair Rex stated she had a request to speak and since this was a Study Session they did not have to grant the request. She asked the Commissioners what they thought in allowing a representative from SAHBA, one of the stakeholders, to speak. The Commission agreed to grant the request.

David Godlewski, SAHBA, Government Liaison, stated he appreciated the opportunity to submit questions and comments regarding the FLD beyond the time the Commission took for the item in study session. He said he appreciated staff’s willingness to keep an open line of communication with the various stakeholders, including SAHBA.

Chair Rex asked if moving this item for public hearing at the October 1, 2008 meeting was enough time to respond to the evening’s comments and comply with notice requirements.

Mr. Elias stated it was. He said staff took the initiative to run the ad for public hearing pending the Commission’s approval. If not approved, a phone call to remove the item from printing would be made.

Chair Rex asked if there was any other discussion and asked for a motion.

It was moved by Commissioner Ronstadt, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan to move the item for Public Hearing on October 1, 2008. The motion passed by a voice vote of 11 to 0 (Commissioner Watson absent).

## **5. CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY ORDINANCE (INFORMATION ITEM)**

Ernie Duarte, Development Services Department, Director, gave an update to the Certificate of Occupancy (C of O) process. He said they have encountered, in the past, some issues related to the Certificates of Occupancy, mostly on existing buildings. He said the Certificate of Occupancy for new construction was pretty straight forward. One gets a permit, does the construction, and passes the inspection that results in a C of O being issued. He said the C of O's for existing buildings has been challenging for the Development Services Department (DSD) over the past two to three years for a number of reasons. He said one reason was the change in the City's tax code. He said the City adopted the Model City's Tax Code and one of the requirements was that before the Finance Department issues a business license, a C of O must be produced. He said another reason was fire inspections. He said the Fire Department was seeking national certification through the International Insurance Services Organization (IISO) to obtain a certain level of accreditation. When conducting inspections throughout major arterials and corridors of commercial businesses, in instances where they are not finding C of O's for existing buildings, they are asking the business owners to come into DSD to obtain one. He said another way of receiving the workload is by normal code enforcement by the Department of Neighborhood Resources. He said all of those combined has provided an influx of C of O business for his department and has been particularly challenging on existing businesses.

Mr. Duarte stated that the Mayor and Council has taken this issue as a priority and directed staff to work on the C of O and adopted a C of O Disclosure Ordinance. He said what the disclosure ordinance did was require potential tenants to come into DSD and check the records on file before signing on the dotted line. In other words, he said there needs to be some disclosure on the landlord's part to the prospective tenant, that they come in and perform some due diligence.

Mr. Duarte said there were other components of the direction the Mayor and Council have taken that DSD has been working on the past few months. He said they had been working on making it easier and simpler for the business owner to obtain the C of O. He said under the current process, DSD required a floor/site plan, and if it was not in DSD's record section it had to be produced by a professional registrant, either an architect or engineer. He said DSD had taken steps to make it easier and simpler for the business owner to produce the document without necessitating hiring an architect or engineer, through something DSD is calling a baseline floor plan which creates a snap shot in time of the existing space and a baseline sight depiction plan.

Mr. Duarte said DSD is also working with a group of stakeholders to simplify the inspection process relating to the C of O. He said the business owners and landlords want more certainty in what is happening out in the field with regards to inspections, both from DSD and the Fire departments. He said these were things DSD has been working with stakeholders over the past six or eight months and stated that Jessie Sanders was spear-heading the project.

Jessie Sanders, Development Services Department, Deputy Director, stated that the project started in February when the Mayor and Council asked DSD to go forward and bring back the disclosure ordinance. He said he chaired the stakeholder group which was comprised of anyone expressing an interest to the Mayor and Council to be a part of the group. He said primarily it was either commercial real estate people or property owners. He said they tried to get tenants involved but were unsuccessful. He said they met and brought it to the point where the Mayor and Council adopted the Certificate of Occupancy Disclosure Ordinance which goes into effect on October 15, 2008. He said in the motion that adopted the ordinance, they also directed DSD, Urban Planning and Design (UPD) and the stakeholders, to begin working on changes to the *Land Use Code* (LUC) to remove, what they called, obstacles to existing buildings. He said that was what was being phrased as providing adaptive reuses to some of the other buildings. He said primarily the issue DSD was encountering was parking.

Mr. Sanders said there are many buildings out there that people have tried to obtain a C of O, for a variety of reasons, and cannot because of the LUC. He said what has happened is that there are a number of people occupying spaces without a C of O and therefore not obtaining permits for the work they are doing. Once the Mayor and Council adopted the ordinance, he said he turned over the control of the stakeholder group to the Metropolitan Pima Alliance because he was too much the focal point and it needed to be the stakeholders. He said the group had been meeting every two to three weeks and sometimes every week. He said it was quite interesting in that the real estate people and business owners are angry because they have been forced into some untenable situations over the years and they wanted some relief. He said they are now at the point where they understand they are part of a community.

Mr. Sanders said the committee had made progress. He said they had difficulty meeting the intent of the motion the Mayor and Council adopted. He said the last few weeks the committee worked on a policy that allowed them to meet the intent of the motion. He said the policy would allow C of O's to any business that can prove a like use had ever legally operated in that space. He said the subcommittee approved the policy at their meeting where members of the Mayor and Council were present and it sunsets in one year.

Further discussion ensued regarding the following items:

- Parking
- LUC simplification
- Grant Road project

(Commissioner Ronstadt departed at 9:37 p.m.)

## **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. Mayor and Council Update**

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director, updated the Commission regarding the Study Session with the Mayor and Council on the Land Use Code (LUC)

simplification and reorganization project by Clarion Associates. He said Clarion Associates compiled a series of recommendations in their diagnosis and have completed a “draft” scope of work based on recommendations. He said the process would take anywhere from twelve to eighteen months for completion.

**b. Other Planning Commission Items (Future agenda items for discussion/assignments)**

The following items were discussed as future agenda items:

- Flexible Lot Development (FLD) LUC Amendment, October 1, 2008
- Jefferson Park Neighborhood Plan, Public Hearing October 1, 2008
- Landscape Code Amendments
- Infill Subcommittee discussion of R-2 lot splits and exceptions

**c. Update on Water and Wastewater Study Oversight Committee by Planning Commission Members**

Commissioner Sullivan gave a brief update. He said the timelines for Phase I and II had been pushed back. Phase I was set for completion by February 27th and Phase II for sometime in October 2009. He said at their next two meetings they will be discussing sustainability and future water resources.

**7. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE**

Michael Toney spoke regarding the Flexible Lot Development LUC Amendment, water issues, and widening of Grant Road.

**8. ADJOURNMENT: 9:51 p.m.**